

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the September 17, 2007 Office Action. This amendment is responsive to the September 17, 2007 Office Action. Reconsideration of the application as currently amended is requested.

Claims 1-105 were pending. Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-35, 37-44, 46, 48-54, 56, 56, 65, 57, 68, 70-72, 74, 77, 80, 84, 86-88, 90, 92, 96, 99, 100 and 102 stand rejected. The examiner acknowledged that claims 12, 24, 36, 45, 47, 55, 58-64, 66, 69, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81-83, 85, 89, 91, 93-95, 97, 98, 101 and 103-15 were directed to allowable subject matter; however, these claims were objected to for depending on a rejected base claim.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 12, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-11 directly depend from claim 1 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 13 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 24, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 13 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 14-23 directly depend from claim 13 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 13.

Claim 25 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 36, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 25 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 26-35 directly depend from claim 25 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 25.

Claim 65 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 66, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 65 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 67-76 directly depend from claim 46 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 66. Claims 71-73 were amended to change their dependencies from claim 66, which was canceled, to claim 65.

New claim 119 is the equivalent of claim 58, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 119 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 120 is the equivalent of claim 73, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 120 should be in condition for allowance. Claims 121-123 directly depend from claim 120 and should thus be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 120.

Claim 77 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 81, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 77 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 79-80 and 82-83 directly depend from claim 77 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 66. Claim 82 was amended to change its dependencies from claim 81, which was canceled, to claim 77.

New claim 124 is the equivalent of claim 91, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 120 should be in condition for allowance. Claim 125 directly depends from claim 124 and should thus be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 124.

New claim 126 is the equivalent of claim 93, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 126 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 127 is the equivalent of claim 94, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 127 should be in condition for allowance. Claim 128 directly depends from claim 127 and should thus be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 127.

Claim 96 has been rewritten to be the equivalent of claim 97, which the examiner indicated was allowable, in independent form containing all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Thus claim 96 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 98-

105 directly depend from claim 96 and should also be in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 96. Claim 105 was amended to change its dependency from claim 97, which was canceled, to claim 96.

New claim 129 is the equivalent of claim 98, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 129 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 129 is the equivalent of claim 98, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 129 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 130 is the equivalent of claim 101, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 130 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 131 is the equivalent of claim 103, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 131 should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 132 is the equivalent of claim 104, which the examiner indicated was allowable, rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 132 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 24, 36, 37-64, 66, 81, 89 and 97 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 46, 49-50, 56, 65, 71, 77, 84, 87-88, 92, 96, 99 and 100 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0009687 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested because the claims have been amended to either include allowable subject matter or depend from a claim containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-35, 37-44, 48, 51-54, 57, 67-68, 70, 72, 74, 80, 86, 90 and 100 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Liu (U.S. Patent Publication


No. 2005/0009687 A1) and Sherman (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0161340 A1).
Withdrawal of this rejection is requested because the claims have been amended to either include allowable subject matter or depend from a claim containing allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested for the reasons just set forth.
If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 72255/30852.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-29-2007


Larry B. Donovan
Registration No. 47,230
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3864
Fax: (216) 592-5009